



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 30, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Soldano
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2004-2528

Dear Ms. Soldano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 198344.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for twenty categories of information pertaining to a specified accident on the Galveston Causeway involving the department, several named individuals, and Infrastructure Services, Inc. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We assume that, to the extent other types of information responsive to the instant request exists, any such information has been released to the requestor. If not, you must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under the circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes a completed investigation made of, for, or by the department, which is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This

¹ We assume the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach and, therefore, does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

section provides that “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body,” is public and may not be withheld unless it is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure by section 552.108. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108. Instead, you assert that the submitted information is protected by section 552.111. This section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body’s interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 8 (2002) (section 552.111 does not constitute other law for purposes of section 552.022); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Thus, the section 552.022 information may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.111.

However, the attorney work product privilege is also found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court held that “[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are ‘other law’ within the meaning of section 552.022.” *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 192.5.

For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under Rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. ORD 677 at 9-10. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under Rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat’l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204.

The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains the attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental

impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

In this instance, you state that “the primary motivating purpose for generating [the submitted information] is to prepare for potential tort litigation involving [the department].” Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information at issue, we conclude that you have established that the section 552.022 submitted information was created in anticipation of litigation and contains an attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. We therefore conclude that you may withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) as core work product under Rule 192.5.

We now address your section 552.111 of the Government Code claim to the remaining information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *Nat’l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial

chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204. Information that meets the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Having considered your arguments and reviewed the remaining submitted information, we agree that the remaining information constitutes privileged work product that may be withheld under section 552.111.

In summary, the section 552.022 information may be withheld under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 198344

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. E.A. "Trey" Apffel, III
1201 Logan Street
Texas City, Texas 77590
(w/o enclosures)